



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

**CERTIFIED MAIL**  
**RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED**

**MAY - 2 2011**

Charles A. Flint, II  
Attorney of Record  
Dennis Ross for Congress (FL-12)  
P.O. Box 7310  
Lakeland, Florida 33807-7310

RE: MUR 6376  
Lori Edwards  
Lori Edwards Campaign Committee  
and Lori Edwards, in her official  
capacity as treasurer  
Polk County Supervisor  
of Elections Office

Dear Mr. Flint:

On April 26, 2011, the Federal Election Commission reviewed the allegations in your complaint dated September 14, 2010, and information provided by Lori Edwards, Lori Edwards Campaign Committee and Lori Edwards, in her official capacity as treasurer ("the Committee"), and the Polk County Supervisor of Elections Office ("Elections Office"), and determined to dismiss the allegations that: Lori Edwards violated 2 U.S.C. § 441b; the Committee violated 2 U.S.C. §§ 434(b) and 441b; and the Elections Office violated 2 U.S.C. § 441b. Accordingly, on April 26, 2011, the Commission closed the file in this matter.

Documents related to the case will be placed on the public record within 30 days. *See* Statement of Policy Regarding Disclosure of Closed Enforcement and Related Files, 68 Fed. Reg. 70,426 (Dec. 18, 2003) and Statement of Policy Regarding Placing First General Counsel's Reports on the Public Record, 74 Fed. Reg. 66132 (Dec. 14, 2009). The Factual and Legal Analyses, which more fully explain the Commission's decision are enclosed.

11044292421

MUR 6376  
Charles A. Flint, II  
Page 2

The Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended, allows a complainant to seek judicial review of the Commission's dismissal of this action. *See* 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(8).

Sincerely,

Christopher Hughey  
Acting General Counsel



BY: Roy Q. Lockett  
Acting Assistant General Counsel

Enclosures  
Factual and Legal Analyses

11044292422

**FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION**

**FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS**

**RESPONDENTS:** Lori Edwards  
Lori Edwards Campaign Committee MUR: 6376  
and Lori Edwards, in her official capacity  
as treasurer

**I. GENERATION OF MATTER**

This matter was generated by a complaint filed with the Federal Election Commission by Charles A. Flint II. See 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(1).

**II. FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS**

**A. Facts**

Lori Edwards is the Polk County, Florida, Supervisor of Elections, an elected, non-partisan position that she has held since 2000. In 2010, Edwards was also the Democratic nominee for the congressional seat that represents most of Polk County and portions of Hillsborough and Osceola Counties. Polk County is an incorporated entity. The Supervisor of Elections position was not on the 2010 ballot.

Beginning August 11, 2010, and up to the August 24, 2010, primary election, the Elections Office disseminated radio and television advertisements informing voters about the upcoming election and encouraging them to vote. The ads provided basic information about the three ways to vote – at the polls, absentee voting, and early voting – and relevant dates and times. Some ads gave specific early voting locations and reminded voters to bring photo identification. Some ads mentioned that there were “important races” on the ballot, and one included the line, “If you don’t vote, they can’t hear you.” *Id.* Edwards speaks in all of the advertisements and identifies herself by name and as the Supervisor of Elections. In the

1 television ad in the Commission's possession, Edwards appears and her name is displayed at the  
2 beginning and at the end for a total of approximately 10 seconds of a 30-second ad. *See*  
3 <http://goo.gl/9SYbg>. She speaks throughout the ad. *Id.*

4 Edwards and the Committee ("Edwards") respond that Florida law and regulations  
5 require Edwards to give non-partisan and unbiased information to voters. Specifically, Edwards  
6 cites to Florida Department of State, Division of Elections Rules 1S-2.033(4)(b)(2009), which  
7 states: "A county supervisor of elections shall: ... Participate in available, radio, television and  
8 print programs and interviews, in both general and minority media outlets, to provide voting  
9 information."

10 Edwards maintains that past "public service announcements" ("PSAs") have been similar  
11 or identical to the 2010 ads and that the Elections Office spent the same amount of funds in 2010  
12 as in past years. Edwards, in a news interview, said the ads cost \$14,500.

13 **B. Legal Analysis**

14 The complaint alleges that the ads constitute coordinated communications because they  
15 meet all three prongs of the Commission's coordination regulations and, thus, resulted in the  
16 Elections Office making prohibited corporate in-kind contributions to Edwards and the  
17 Committee totaling \$14,500. Polk County's incorporated status is the basis for complaint's  
18 allegation that the Elections Office made, and Edwards and the Committee accepted, prohibited  
19 corporate in-kind contributions. The complaint also alleges that Edwards and the Committee  
20 failed to report the in-kind contributions.

21 The Commission exercises its prosecutorial discretion and dismisses this matter due to  
22 the nature of the communications at issue. Here, Edwards and the Elections Office disseminated  
23 voter education PSAs that strictly adhered to Edwards's official duties as Supervisor of

1 Elections. Moreover, Florida law requires that the Supervisor engage in such activities, and none  
2 of Edwards's statements promotes or even mentions her candidacy for federal office. Indeed, the  
3 content of her PSAs appears to be less candidate-focused than another matter that the  
4 Commission dismissed involving an officeholder who made communications while  
5 simultaneously running for federal office. In MUR 5770 (Laffey), City of Cranston Mayor and  
6 federal Senate candidate Laffey mailed a cover letter along with yearly property tax bills to city  
7 residents that, among other things, listed the accomplishments the City achieved while he was  
8 Mayor. Although the letter arguably constituted a coordinated communication, the Commission  
9 exercised its prosecutorial discretion and dismissed the matter, citing the nature of the  
10 communication and the low dollar amount involved (\$3,366). *See* MUR 5770 (Statement of  
11 Reasons). By contrast, Edwards did not discuss her accomplishments in the PSAs as Laffey did  
12 in his letter. Instead, the PSA squarely focuses on her official duties as mandated by Florida law.  
13 *But see* MUR 5815 (Madrid) (Commission found reason to believe that public information  
14 mailer regarding suspected meth labs sent by Attorney General/House candidate Madrid  
15 constituted a coordinated communication and authorized an investigation; after investigation, the  
16 Commission found conduct prong not satisfied and took no further action).

17 Recently, in MUR 6020 (Pelosi), the Commission determined in a similar case that even  
18 if a 501(c) group's advertisement featuring then-House Speaker and candidate Nancy Pelosi and  
19 former Speaker Newt Gingrich satisfied the Commission's coordination standard, the exercise of  
20 prosecutorial discretion warranted a dismissal. MUR 6020 (Pelosi) (Statement of Reasons of  
21 Walther, Petersen, Bauerly, Hunter and McGahn). The Commission noted that the respondent  
22 chose Pelosi and Gingrich for the ad to be humorous and show bipartisanship, and the purpose of

1 the ads was to further the 501(c) group's goal of focusing public attention on the policy issue of  
2 climate change, not on Pelosi's role as a candidate. *Id.* at 5-6.

3 Here, there are a number of factors supporting dismissal of this matter. The Elections  
4 Office has apparently prepared "similar or identical" ads in the past. The purposes of the ads  
5 appear to be to inform voters about voting locations, times, identification requirements, and early  
6 voting/absentee voting options, and to encourage participation. The ads do not focus on  
7 Edwards's role as a federal candidate and do not appear to contain any electoral content  
8 regarding her candidacy. Although she is not required to appear in the ads herself, a state  
9 regulation requires Edwards, as the Supervisor of Elections, to educate voters through "available  
10 radio, television and print programs" to provide voting information. Under these circumstances,  
11 including the nature of the communications, the Commission has determined to exercise its  
12 prosecutorial discretion, dismiss the complaint in this matter, and close the file. *See Heckler v.*  
13 *Chaney*, 470 U.S. 821, 831 (1985).

**FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION**

**FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS**

**RESPONDENT:** Polk County Supervisor of Elections Office **MUR: 6376**

**I. GENERATION OF MATTER**

This matter was generated by a complaint filed with the Federal Election Commission by Charles A. Flint II. *See* 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(1).

**II. FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS**

**A. Facts**

Lori Edwards is the Polk County, Florida, Supervisor of Elections, an elected, non-partisan position that she has held since 2000. In 2010, Edwards was also the Democratic nominee for the congressional seat that represents most of Polk County and portions of Hillsborough and Osceola Counties. Polk County is an incorporated entity. The Supervisor of Elections position was not on the 2010 ballot.

Beginning August 11, 2010, and up to the August 24, 2010, primary election, the Elections Office disseminated radio and television advertisements informing voters about the upcoming election and encouraging them to vote. The ads provided basic information about the three ways to vote – at the polls, absentee voting, and early voting – and relevant dates and times. Some ads gave specific early voting locations and reminded voters to bring photo identification. Some ads mentioned that there were “important races” on the ballot, and one included the line, “If you don’t vote, they can’t hear you.” *Id.* Edwards speaks in all of the advertisements and identifies herself by name and as the Supervisor of Elections. *Id.* In the television ad in the Commission’s possession, Edwards appears and her name is displayed at the

1 beginning and at the end for a total of approximately 10 seconds of a 30-second ad. *See*

2 <http://goo.gl/9SYbg>. She speaks throughout the ad. *Id.*

3 The Polk County Supervisor of Elections Office ("Elections Office") responds that  
4 Florida law and regulations require Edwards to give non-partisan and unbiased information to  
5 voters. Specifically, Florida Department of State, Division of Elections Rules 1S-

6 2.033(4)(b)(2009) states: "A county supervisor of elections shall: ... Partieipate in available,  
7 radio, television and print programs and interviews, in both general and minority madia outlets,  
8 to provide voting information."

9 The Elections Office maintains that past "public service announcements" ("PSAs") have  
10 been similar or identical to the 2010 ads and that it spent the same amount of funds in 2010 as in  
11 past years. Further, the Elections Office asserts that the ads were not created for the purpose of  
12 influencing the election or concerning campaign matters. According to the Elections Office, the  
13 ads cost about \$11,000. Edwards, in a news interview, said the ads cost \$14,500.

14 **B. Legal Analysis**

15 The complaint alleges that the ads constitute coordinated communications because they  
16 meet all three prongs of the Commission's coordination regulations and, thus, resulted in the  
17 Elections Office making prohibited corporate in-kind contributions to Edwards and the  
18 Committee totaling \$14,500. Polk County's incorporated status is the basis for complainant's  
19 allegation that the Elections Office made, and Edwards and her authorized Committee accepted,  
20 prohibited corporate in-kind contributions.

21 The Commission exercises its prosecutorial discretion and dismisses this matter due to  
22 the nature of the communications at issue. Here, Edwards and the Elections Office disseminated  
23 voter education PSAs that strictly adhered to Edwards's official duties as Supervisor of



1 Elections. Moreover, Florida law requires that the Supervisor engage in such activities, and none  
2 of Edwards's statements promotes or even mentions her candidacy for federal office. Indeed, the  
3 content of her PSAs appears to be less candidate-focused than another matter that the  
4 Commission dismissed involving an officeholder who made communications while  
5 simultaneously running for federal office. In MUR 5770 (Laffey), City of Cranston Mayor and  
6 federal Senate candidate Laffey mailed a cover letter along with yearly property tax bills to city  
7 residents that, among other things, listed the accomplishments the City achieved while he was  
8 Mayor. Although the letter arguably constituted a coordinated communication, the Commission  
9 exercised its prosecutorial discretion and dismissed the matter, citing the nature of the  
10 communication and low dollar amount involved (\$3,366). See MUR 5770 (Statement of  
11 Reasons). By contrast, Edwards did not discuss her accomplishments in the PSAs as Laffey did  
12 in his letter. Instead, the PSA squarely focuses on her official duties as mandated by Florida law.  
13 But see MUR 5815 (Madrid) (Commission found reason to believe that public information  
14 mailer regarding suspected meth labs sent by Attorney General/House candidate Madrid  
15 constituted a coordinated communication and authorized an investigation; after investigation, the  
16 Commission found conduct proper and not satisfied and took no further action).

17 Recently, in MUR 6020 (Pelosi), the Commission determined in a similar case that even  
18 if a 501(c) group's advertisement featuring then-House Speaker and candidate Nancy Pelosi and  
19 former Speaker Newt Gingrich satisfied the Commission's coordination standard, the exercise of  
20 prosecutorial discretion warranted a dismissal. MUR 6020 (Pelosi) (Statement of Reasons of  
21 Walther, Petersen, Bauerly, Hunter and McGahn). The Commission noted that the respondent  
22 chose Pelosi and Gingrich for the ad to be humorous and show bipartisanship, and the purpose of

1 the ads was to further the 501(c) group's goal of focusing public attention on the policy issue of  
2 climate change, not on Pelosi's role as a candidate. *Id.* at 5-6.

3 Here, there are a number of factors supporting dismissal of this matter. The Elections  
4 Office has apparently prepared "similar or identical" ads in the past. The purposes of the ads  
5 appear to be to inform voters about voting locations, times, identification requirements, and early  
6 voting/absentee voting options, and to encourage participation. The ads do not focus on  
7 Edwards's role as a federal candidate and do not appear to contain any electoral content  
8 regarding her candidacy. Although she is not required to appear in the ads herself, a state  
9 regulation requires Edwards, as the Supervisor of Elections, to educate voters through "available  
10 radio, television and print programs" to provide voting information. Under these circumstances,  
11 including the nature of the communications, the Commission has determined to exercise its  
12 prosecutorial discretion, dismiss the complaint in this matter, and close the file. *See Heckler v.*  
13 *Chaney*, 470 U.S. 821, 831 (1985).

11044292430